

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

P-2004PCT-11

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/019061

International filing date (day/month/year)

21.12.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

07.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

SENJU METAL INDUSTRY CO., LTD

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/019061

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language

_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐

a sequence listing

☐

table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐

in written format

☐

in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐

contained in the international application as filed.

☐

filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐

furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/019061

Box No. IV

Lack of unity of invention

1. ☐ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:
- ☒ paid additional fees
- ☐ paid additional fees under protest
- ☐ not paid additional fees
2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
- ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

The inventions relating to claims 1-4 relate to a reflow furnace capable of performing rapid heating up to a high temperature in a main heating zone, and in order to maintain balance of the amount of hot-air blown from a preliminary heating zone and main heating zone and to stabilize the oxygen concentration, having the total area of blowing holes per unit area of a hole plate of a hot-air blowing-type heater installed in a main heating zone is 1.5 to 5 times larger than that of blowing holes per unit area of a hole plate of a hot-air blowing-type heater installed in a preliminary heating zone.

The inventions relating to claims 5-6 relate to a hot-air blowing-type heater configured such that in order to have hot-air uniformly blown from all of the holes, blowing sections have larger area than that of the sucking section, and there is provided on top of the blowing sections a hole plate in which a number of blowing holes are created.

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☒ all parts
- ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos. _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/019061

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-6	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-6	YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-6	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The inventions relating to claims 1-6 are not described in any of the documents cited in the ISR; nor would they be obvious to a party skilled in the art.